United States Patent and Trademark Office

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/014,773	12/11/2001	Hannu Konttinen	413-010727-US(PAR)	9944

2512   7590   08/23/2005

PERMAN & GREEN
425 POST ROAD
FAIRFIELD, CT 06824

EXAMINER
LUDWIG, MATTHEW J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/014,773	KONTTINEN, HANNU
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Matthew J. Ludwig	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _02 June 2005_.

2a)☒ This action is FINAL.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-14_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-14_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

      1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed 6/2/05. The application

claims the foreign priority date 12/15/2000 in accordance with foreign priority papers filed

12/11/2001.

2.   Claims 1-14 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 7, and 14, are independent claims.

3.   Claims 1-14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warnock have

been withdrawn as necessitated by applicant's amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

5.   **Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over**

Warnock et al., USPN 5,634,064 filed (8/2/1996) in view of Bricklin et al., USPN 6,928,609

filed (1/16/2001).

In reference to independent claim 1, Warnock teaches:

Once a source document has been created, it is converted into a Portable Document

Format (PDF) document, which has the formatting and appearance of the originally created

document (compare to "*the said pages are preprocessed in order to read the text portion in*

them"). See column 5, lines 45-67. The applicant is reminded that the claims limitations are to be

given their broadest reasonable interpretation within the scope of the art. Without any

explanation as to how the preprocessing is occurring, the limitation fails to preclude the

Examiner from utilizing the conversion of source document into PDF documents to read text

portions within the document as a preprocessing step.

After the article sections have been selected and linked, a window is provided for the

entry of article properties. More specifically, window allows the title, subject, author, and key

words pertaining to the article to be entered into the viewing system (compare to "the text is

searched for a start element and an end element"). See column 8, lines 1-20. The limitation fails

to mention how the text is searched and what constitutes a start element and end element. Again,

the broad nature of the term start element and end element within the limitations of the claim

could be described by any word, sentence, paragraph, or link found within a document.

Therefore, the first paragraph would constitute a start and end element.

One type of scroll is the normal page scroll which allows a reader to scroll around in the

current page. This is typically controlled by the computer's operating system or the presentation

manager (compare to "a new start element and end element are searched for if the user gives a

shift command"). See column 9, lines 40-67. The scrolling mechanism allows the user to shift

through the document based on simple keyboard features. The reference fails to explicitly state

the shift key; however, the scrolling mechanism provides a similar result. Furthermore, the

reference discloses the employment of a hot key for providing article properties. The utilization

of the shift key to implement the functions of a hot key was well known in the art at the time the

invention was made. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to have utilized the scrolling mechanism and the hot keys as a

method to shift through any type of PDF document for easy access to various parts of the document and proficient presentation of PDF documents.

The reference provides a display window, however, Warnock fails to explicitly divide the preprocessed document into various display windows. Bricklin describes a document presented in multiple windows for multiple views. The display screens shown in 17a and 17b both include a contents map window, a lexia display window, a navigational window, and a scrolling frame. Furthermore, the reference contains a search function that allows searches to be made of the content of each of the lexia of a hypermedia work. For example, a search can be limited to the non-displayed nicknames of lexia, or to nicknames and summaries, or to titles and displayed content. Text searches could also be performed by the present invention. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have combined the multiple display methods taught by Bricklin with the single display methods of Warnock because it would have given the author added windows for enhanced editing features and organization of document data through the use of a navigational window, a contents map window, and a lexia window.

In reference to dependent claim 2, Warnock teaches:

Throughout the specification the expression "layout" and "format" are used somewhat interchangeably to denote the process of determining a particular physical relationship and appearance for document content information. For example, layout and format information determine line breaks, hyphenation, and justification for text. See column 6, lines 23-45.

In reference to dependent claim 3, Warnock teaches:

Throughout the specification the expression "layout" and "format" are used somewhat interchangeably to denote the process of determining a particular physical relationship and

appearance for document content information. For example, layout and format information

determine line breaks, hyphenation, and justification for text. See column 6, lines 23-45.

In reference to dependent claim 4, Warnock teaches:

    If the system detects a page scroll, a scroll command is generated and the user is allowed

to scroll within the page. This page scroll is typically accomplished by the use of the standard

horizontal and vertical scroll bars provided. See column 9, lines 40-57. It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the inventions was made to have utilized the

scroll mechanism to access one step forward, one step backward, to the beginning of next

paragraph, etc. because it would have given the user a proficient means for viewing any part of

the document utilizing the horizontal and vertical scroll bars.

In reference to dependent claim 5, Warnock teaches:

    If the system detects a page scroll, a scroll command is generated and the user is allowed

to scroll within the page. This page scroll is typically accomplished by the use of the standard

horizontal and vertical scroll bars provided. See column 9, lines 40-57. It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the inventions was made to have utilized the

scroll mechanism to access one step forward, one step backward, to the beginning of next

paragraph, etc. because it would have given the user a proficient means for viewing any part of

the document utilizing the horizontal and vertical scroll bars.

In reference to dependent claim 6, Warnock teaches:

    It should be noted that this new portion of the article is automatically panned and zoomed

to fit within the article view area of the window, as with the previous article section, to enhance

readability. See column 9, lines 50-55.

In reference to dependent claim 7, Warnock teaches:

Once a source document has been created, it is converted into a Portable Document

Format (PDF) document, which has the formatting and appearance of the originally created

document (compare to *"the said pages are preprocessed in order to read the text portion in*

them"). See column 5, lines 45-67. The applicant is reminded that the claims limitations are to be

given their broadest reasonable interpretation within the scope of the art. Without any

explanation as to how the preprocessing is occurring, the limitation fails to preclude the

Examiner from utilizing the conversion of source document into PDF documents to read text

portions within the document.

It should be noted that this new portion of the article is automatically panned and zoomed

to fit within the article view area of the window, as with the previous article section, to enhance

readability (compare to *"a means for dividing the display into a navigation page and read pane*

and for bringing an overall view of the received pages in the navigation pane"). See column 9,

lines 50-55.

If the system detects a page scroll, a scroll command is generated and the user is allowed

to scroll within the page. This page scroll is typically accomplished by the use of the standard

horizontal and vertical scroll bars provided (compare to *"selecting the reading portion*

comprising a program arranged to find a start and end point for the reading portion on the

basis of rules of a selected language and to change reading portions according to user

commands"). See column 9, lines 40-57. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time the inventions was made to have utilized the scroll mechanism to access one

step forward, one step backward, to the beginning of next paragraph, etc. because it would have

given the user a proficient means for viewing any part of the document utilizing the horizontal

and vertical scroll bars.

In reference to dependent claim 8, Wornock teaches:

This page scroll is typically accomplished by the use of the standard horizontal and

vertical scroll bars provided. See column 9, lines 55-67.

In reference to dependent claim 9, Wornock teaches:

A hyperlink from another application program could be used to launch the article-reading

mode. See column 10, lines 45-50.

In reference to dependent claims 10-14, the limitations recite instructions used for performing the

methods as claimed in claims 1-9, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the

same rationale.

Response to Arguments

6.   In response to applicant's amendment filed on June 2, 2005, the examiner believes the

argument regarding the preprocessing of hypertext pages is not persuasive. The limitation fails to

preclude the Examiner from utilizing the conversion of source document into PDF documents to

read text portions within the document as a preprocessing step. Once a source document has been

created as taught by Warnock, it is converted into a Portable Document Format (PDF) document,

which has the formatting and appearance of the originally created document.

The applicant argues on page 6 of the amendment that Warnock fails to teach the

selection of start and end elements to define hypertext. The examiner believes the applicant is

arguing a limitation, 'selection of start and end elements to define hypertext to be displayed in

the read pane', which could not be found within the limitations of the claim. Based on the

limitation, 'searching the text for a start element and end element', the examiner could interpret

that as any piece of text, link, sentence, paragraph, title, etc.

Finally, the newly added subject matter added to the independent claim changes the scope

of the claim when read as a whole. Therefore, the Bricklin reference has been added to provide a

multiple window view of data and a searching method that could also be interpreted as a method

based on text, title, link, i.e. a start element and end element.

Conclusion

7.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Ludwig whose telephone number is 571-272-4127.

The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ML
August 18, 2005

WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
8/18/2005